



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO		FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/936,271		09/10/2001	George M Yousef	MTS3USA	2550
270	7590	11/02/2004		EXAMINER	
HOWSON		- <del>-</del>	QIAN, CELINE X		
ONE SPRI BOX 457	NG HOU	SE CORPORATION	ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
321 NORR	ISTOWN	ROAD	1636		
SPRING H	OUSE, F	PA 19477	DATE MAILED: 11/02/2004		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		09/936,271	YOUSEF ET AL				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Celine X Qian	1636				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with t	he correspondence address				
A SH THE   - Exter after - If the - If NO - Failu Any I	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. In the major of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. In period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply operiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	66(a). In no event, however, may a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30 iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS cause the application to become ABAND	be timely filed ) days will be considered timely. from the mailing date of this communication. ONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
, —	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>17 August 2004</u> .  This action is <b>FINAL</b> . 2b) This action is non-final.  Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Dispositi	on of Claims						
5)⊠ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) 33 and 47-60 is/are pending in the appearance of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) 33 and 47-53 is/are allowed.  Claim(s) 54-60 is/are rejected.  Claim(s) is/are objected to.  Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	vn from consid <b>eration</b> .					
Applicati	on Papers						
10)⊠	The specification is objected to by the Examiner The drawing(s) filed on <u>10 September 2001</u> is/a Applicant may not request that any objection to the o Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	re: a) accepted or b) ob drawing(s) be held in abeyance. on is required if the drawing(s) is	See 37 CFR 1.85(a). s objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).				
Priority u	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
a)[	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign  All b) Some * c) None of:  1. Certified copies of the priority documents  2. Certified copies of the priority documents  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priori application from the International Bureau  See the attached detailed Office action for a list of	s have been received. s have been received in Appli ity documents have been rec (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	cation No eived in this National Stage				
2) Notice 3) Inform	e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date	4)  Interview Summ Paper No(s)/Ma 5)  Notice of Inform 6)  Other:					

Art Unit: 1636

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

Claims 33 and 47-60 are pending in the application.

This Office Action is in response to the Amendment filed on 8/17/04.

## Response to Amendment

The objection to claim 52 has been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment of the claim.

The rejection of claim 49 under 35 U.S.C.101 has been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment of the claim.

The rejection of claims 33, 47, 48 and 50 under 35 U.S.C. 112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph (scope of enablement) has been withdrawn in light of Applicant's amendment of the claims.

Claim 54 and newly added claims 55 and 56 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C.112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph (new matter) for reasons set forth of the record mailed on 5/17/04 and further

Newly added claims 57-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C.112 1<sup>st</sup> paragraph for reasons set forth of the record mailed on 5/17/04 and further discussed below.

#### Response to Arguments

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 54 and newly added claims 55 and 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably

Art Unit: 1636

convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

In response to this rejection, Applicants argue that one of ordinary skill in the art would readily recognize the recited nucleic acid sequence based on the teaching of specification, Figure 7 and SEQ ID NO:13. Applicants assert that the recited fragments represent either exon or intron of the KLK-L2 gene, and are readily identified by Figure 7. Applicants thus conclude that they do not constitute new matter.

These arguments have been fully considered but deemed unpersuasive. As discussed in previous office action, the MPEP states "New matter includes not only the addition of wholly unsupported subject matter, but may also include adding specific percentages or compounds after a broader original disclosure, or even the omission of a step from a method." See MPEP § 608.04 to § 608.04(c). The specification does not disclose these specific recited fragments. SEQ ID NO:13 is the entire genomic sequence of KLK-L2 gene, which does not list these specific fragments. Figure 7 illustrates the exon intron boundary without indicate these specific fragments as well. The Figure 7 with labeled fragments provided in exhibit A is not the original drawing provided with the specification. The original Figure 7 (and the description provided in the specification) entered on 9/10/01 does not have list any fragments. Therefore, the specification does not provide sufficient support for the recited fragments. Thus, the new matter rejection is maintained.

Claims 55 and 56 are rejected for same reason as discussed above.

Art Unit: 1636

# New Grounds of Rejection Necessitated by Applicant's Amendment Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

Claim 57 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention.

Claim 57 is rejected for same reason as discussed in previous office action (5/17/04) as applied to original claim 33 (see page 3, last paragraph through page 5). Briefly, the specification discloses that SEQ ID NO:13 is a genomic DNA sequence encoding KLK-L2 protein, and it is about 11.5kb in length. This gene encodes a polypeptide that consists 293 amino acid. However, the specification does not disclose a RNA sequence represented by the sequence of SEQ ID NO:13, in which the T is replaced with U. Further, the specification fails to teach a method to make the RNA represented by SEQ ID NO:13, or how to use such RNA molecule. The prior art teaches that a genomic sequence encoding a protein comprises 5' or 3' regulatory region, introns and exons. Messenger RNA is transcribed from only exons of said genomic sequence, which skips the sequences from 5' or 3' regulatory region and introns. There is no RNA 100% complementary to a gene (genomic DNA sequence comprises 5' or 3' regulatory region, introns and exons). Therefore, one skilled in the art would have to rely on the teaching of the specification to make and use the invention as claimed. The specification only

Art Unit: 1636

teaches a nucleic acid sequence represented by SEQ ID NO:13, in which T can also be U. The specification fails to teach how to make and use such RNA molecules. Without such information, one skilled in the art would have to engage in undue experimentation to make and use the claimed invention.

Applicants' argument that generating RNA from the disclosed DNA is common knowledge is unpersuasive. Although replacing T to U may be achievable, the specification fails to teach how to use such RNA spanning both intron and exon of the genomic sequence that encodes KLK-L2. Therefore, the claimed invention is not enabled by the instant specification.

Claims 58-60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the written description requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention.

The written description requirement is set forth by 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph which states that the: "specification shall contain a written description of the invention. . . [emphasis added]." The written description requirement has been well established and characterized in the case law. A specification must convey to one of skill in the art that "as of the filing date sought, [the inventor] was in possession of the invention." See Vas Cath v. Mahurkar 935 F.2d 1555, 1560 19 USPQ2d 1111, 1117 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Applicant may show that he is in "possession" of the invention claimed by describing the invention with all of its claimed limitations "by such descriptive means as words, structures, figures, diagrams, formulas, etc., that fully set forth the

Art Unit: 1636

claimed invention." See *Lockwood v. American Airlines Inc.* 107 F.3d 1565, 1572, 41 USPQ2d 1961, 1966 (Fed. Cir. 1997).

In analyzing whether the written description requirement is met, it is first determined whether a representative number of species have been described by their complete structure. Next, it is determined whether a representative number of species have been sufficiently described by other relevant identifying characteristics. The claims are drawn to an isolated nucleic acid molecules which hybridize to SEQ ID NO:13 under stringent condition. The claims encompass potentially a large genus of nucleic acid molecules of various sizes and structures. The specification only discloses one KLK-L2 protein having the genomic sequence of SEQ ID NO:13. The specification fails to disclose any other nucleic acids of various sizes that hybridize to SEQ ID NO:13 encode the KLK-L2 protein which possesses serine protease function. As such, the structural functional relationship between the claimed nucleic acid molecule and its function as a serine protease is missing. Therefore, the written description requirement is not met.

#### Conclusion

Claims 33, 47-53 are allowable.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE

MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO

MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after

Art Unit: 1636

the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Celine X Qian whose telephone number is 571-272-0777. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:30-6:00 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Remy Yucel Ph.D. can be reached on 571-272-0781. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Celine Qian, Ph.D.